

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**LAUREL HILL ADAPTIVE REUSE CITIZEN TASK FORCE MEETING**  
**December 18, 2003 / 7:00 PM**

**Task Force Members Present:** Tim Sargeant (Chair), Robert W. Cosgriff (Vice-Chair), Albert B. Akers, Neal McBride, Penny Wilkinson, Jennifer Heinz

**Task Force Members Absent:** Irma Clifton, Sheila Coates, Beverly Cosham, Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Douglas M. Wren, Dave Patten, Brian Scott Tishuk

**Department of Planning and Zoning:** Marianne Gardner, Charlene Fuhrman-Schulz, Lindsay Mason

**Department of Transportation:** Jaak Pedak

**EDAW:** Paul Moyer, David from ERA

**I. Review of November 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Tim Sargeant called the meeting to order and asked the Task Force members for comments on the meeting summary from November 20, 2003. Members asked for the file to be resent over email so that they may review and approve it at the next meeting.

Neal McBride asked for clarification on who has responsibility for the care of the Laurel Hill house and what they plan to do with it. Since the Comprehensive Plan considers it part of the Park Authority property, it seems that the Park Authority should make plans for the stabilization of the building.

**II. General Transportation Update**

Jaak Pedak from the Department of Transportation provided a handout with updated Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) average daily traffic counts from 2002. The decrease in many of the counts can be at least partially attributed to the closure of the prison, while increases on other roads are related to road improvements and new development.

The second page of the handout shows VDOT's 1997 traffic forecast for 2020. Mr. Pedak believes a new study should be done to reflect recent development in the area. Silverbrook Road in particular would likely have another 5,000 trips because much of the development is clustered there (including the schools, park uses, Laurel Hill redevelopment, and the Pulte project).

The Task Force asked whether the Park Authority Board has requested a new study. Answer: The Park Authority was told they don't have authorization to request a study to abandon Lorton Road. However, they would like to pursue a Comprehensive Plan change to do away with the option to expand the road to 6 lanes. Although the OTPA has not been authorized, Supervisor Gerry Hyland has said this will go forward.

Furnace Road was planned to be widened from 2 to 4 lanes, but this was based on anticipation of expansion of the landfill. The landfill has since been closed.

Question from Tim Sargeant: Do you have any suggestions on the types of uses that would be desirable from a transportation point of view?

Mr. Pedak: A good mix of uses would be best so that we don't have everyone going in the same direction at the same time. Not concentrating development also helps. The traffic volumes of the land uses and intensities now being considered are not that significant compared to the original plan for the area.

Question from Albert Akers: ULI came up with some suggestions for managing traffic: is there anything that can be done on Silverbrook to slow traffic?

Mr. Pedak: Generally DOT doesn't do much traffic calming on arterial roads except lowering speed limits.

Follow-up comment from Mr. Akers: We would ask DOT to take a look at the traffic calming issue on Silverbrook, because this road will be going through a neighborhood and by schools.

Charlene Fuhrman-Schulz presented an update from Gary Chevalier on the parking estimates for the high school. Westfield High School has 44 buses, 292 staff parking permits, and 750 student parking permits. This does not include visitors, volunteers, parents, and after-school activities.

Question from Neal McBride: On January 5<sup>th</sup> there will be a public hearing on transportation enhancement projects – are there any proposals or requests for projects in the Laurel Hill area?

Answer: Staff is not aware of any proposals.

### **III. Market Potential Use Analysis**

Paul Moyer and David ??? from EDAW presented the Draft Potential Reuse Analysis for the reformatory and penitentiary area. The reuse analysis examines four concept plan scenarios with different mixtures of uses to test how each could work on the site physically and financially. Scenario 1 is the plan developed by ULI, which contains a mixture of residential and retail uses. Scenario 2 modifies the ULI plan by reducing the intensity of the residential and retail uses, and reconfigures these uses slightly. Scenario 3 further reduces the residential and retail uses, and adds educational uses. Scenario 4 consists of only retail and educational or cultural uses. See the Draft Potential Reuse Analysis document for details of the report.

Question from Mr. Akers: Should we consider taking down the wall?

Answer: The ARB would take it to task, but the EDAW team thinks parts should be removed to help provide visual connections and improve access.

Question from Mr. Akers: Does EDAW form a conclusion for which scenario is preferred?

Answer: Nothing concrete. We would like to explore the idea of switching the locations of the educational and residential uses in Scenario 3. It is more appealing in the market to offer multiple uses to the users, so mixed use seems to make the most sense. Education seems to be the more difficult to make work financially.

Comment from Mr. McBride: Although there is an intrinsic quality of life value in education that doesn't show up in the market analysis.

Comment from Robert Cosgriff: The Smithsonian only displays 1% of their collection at any given time – maybe they would be interested in a museum at the Laurel Hill site. There may be fewer rehabilitation costs associated with museum uses than some of the other uses.

Mr. Moyer: We would need to be careful with that because 1) it would need to be differentiated from the Lorton Arts Foundation, and 2) it may be difficult to attract the Smithsonian due to the location and other factors.

Question from Mr. Sargeant: We don't want to jeopardize one project for another. Would we be in competition with the Lorton Arts Foundation for tax credits and grants for rehabilitating the buildings?

Answer: Paul Moyer will get more information to help clarify what might be available in terms of grants, etc.

Although the costs of rehabilitating the buildings seems prohibitive, there are developers out there that do these kind of projects. The Forest Glen reuse project just found a developer through an RFP process, and those buildings are in worse shape than the Laurel Hill buildings.

Ms. Fuhrman-Schulz presented a handout on the status of the Laurel Hill asbestos abatement and building stabilization efforts. The handout details what work is scheduled to be done, how the budgeted money is being spent, and the additional funding needed. In terms of stabilization, JMA has been contracted to conduct an assessment and cost analysis.

Question from Neal McBride: What is being done in the meantime to stop obvious deterioration?  
Answer from Marianne Gardner: No priorities have been set, but as things are identified through the assessment we can go forward. No money has been budgeted for repairs at this time once the emergency repair funds run out.

Staff will report on the stabilization efforts every month.

#### **IV. Preparing for the January 17<sup>th</sup> Planning Workshop**

Mr. Sargeant handed out a list of material to cover for the workshop from the last 13 months. The Contributing Structures document was also added to the list.

Any new proposals should be given to the Task Force in writing no later than mid-January.

The meeting was adjourned.

***The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for 7:00 p.m., Thursday, January 8, 2003, Room 232 at the Fairfax County Government Center.***